IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No.6657 of 2007

Dated: April 10, 2007

Between:

G. Brahmendra, S/o. G. Nookachari,
Aged about 20 years, Occ: Student,
R/o. Devarapalli Mandal & Village,
Visakhapatnam District.

… Petitioner

And

The Convener, EAMCET/ECET (FDH)-2004,
Admissions, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam,
And another.

… Respondents

Order:

Petitioner seeks a Writ of Mandamus to direct the respondents either to allow him to pursue Engineering course in the second respondent college or to accommodate him in any other college from the academic year 2006-07.

2. The case of the petitioner, who belongs to B.C 'B' category, is

that he appeared for EAMCET-2004 with hall ticket No.2701103 and secured '66873' rank. It is stated that in the counselling held on 08-09-2004, he was allotted to Aditya Institute of Technology and Management, Tekkali in the branch of Mechanical Engineering, however, in the re-counselling held on 27-10-2004, he was allotted to the second respondent college. The grievance of the petitioner is that though he was re-allotted to the second respondent college, he was not permitted to join on the ground that he did not produce provisional allotment order.

3. Though it is stated that petitioner was allotted to the second respondent college in the year 2004, and was not permitted to join there, this is the first time the petitioner has approached this court, i.e. in the year 2007. It is to be seen that allotment and admission of students to engineering colleges is made as per the intake capacity. Such exercise is made afresh for each academic year as per the rules of admission. In the absence of any allotment order, allotting the petitioner to the second respondent college, no fault can be found with the second respondent college, in not allowing him to join in its college. In any event, on the ground that he was not allowed to pursue the course pursuant to the alleged allotment to second respondent college during the academic year 2004-05, petitioner cannot straightway seek directions to the respondents either to permit him to pursue the course or to accommodate him in any other college from the academic year 2006-07. No direction as sought for can be given.

4. The Writ Petition is devoid of merits and is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

April 10, 2007
MRR